

EC



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,597	11/20/2001	Xiao-Dong Yang	03226.102001;P5991	1542

32615 7590 10/21/2003

ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P. / SUN  
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800  
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

GARBOWSKI, LEIGH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2825

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,597

Applicant(s)

YANG ET AL.

Examiner

Leigh Marie Garbowski

Art Unit

2825

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 19 and 20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1-14 and 19-20 are allowed. Applicant's amendments and arguments with respect to these claims have been fully considered and are persuasive, thus the outstanding rejections have been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Particularly as per claim 15, the antecedent basis for "the creating" [last two words of the claim] is confusing considering that there are two "creating" steps.

The dependent claims are rejected for incorporating the error of the independent claim by dependency.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 2825

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al. [U.S. Patent #5,629,860].

As per claim 15, Jones et al. disclose a method for creating a wire load model comprising: creating an interconnect configuration [column 1, lines 60-62]; generating parasitic information for the interconnect information, wherein the parasitic information comprises capacitance and resistance information [column 2, lines 23-32]; storing the parasitic information in an accessible format [column 5, lines 7-12]; and creating the wire load model dependent on the parasitic information [column 5, lines 49-65], wherein the creating comprises selecting an error bound [column 1, lines 35-41; column 2, lines 15-22; column 9, lines 35-49]. As per claim 16, Jones et al. further disclose wherein generating parasitic information uses an empirical database [column 2, lines 23-32; column 5, lines 49-65], the examiner takes Official Notice that this feature anticipates the use of a field solver. As per claim 17, Jones et al. further disclose wherein creating the wire load model uses a non-linear curve-fitting engine [column 5, lines 52-65]. As per claim 18, Jones et al. further disclose wherein the parasitic information comprises at least once selected from the group consisting of an area capacitance, a coupling capacitance, and a fringe capacitance [column 2, lines 23-32].

Claims 15-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yip et al. [U.S. Patent #5,694,344].

As per claim 15, Yip et al. disclose a method for creating a wire load model comprising: creating an interconnect configuration [column 3, lines 60-61]; generating

parasitic information for the interconnect configuration, wherein the parasitic information comprises capacitance and resistance information [column 4, lines 58-59]; storing the parasitic information in an accessible format [column 4, lines 21-27]; and creating the wire load model dependent on the parasitic information [column 3, lines 61-64], wherein the creating comprises selecting an error bound [column 3, lines 15-22]. As per claim 16, Yip et al. further disclose wherein generating parasitic information uses a field solver [column 4, lines 58-63]. As per claim 18, Yip et al. further disclose wherein the parasitic information comprises at least once selected from the group consisting of an area capacitance, a coupling capacitance, and a fringe capacitance [column 2, lines 31-35].

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ponnappalli et al. [U.S. Patent #6,175,947].

As per claim 15, Ponnappalli et al. disclose a method for creating a wire load model comprising: creating an interconnect configuration [column 5, lines 16-28]; generating parasitic information for the interconnect information, wherein the parasitic information comprises capacitance and resistance information [column 2, lines 30-34; column 7, lines 13-15]; storing the parasitic information in an accessible format [column 6, lines 26-31; column 7, line 15]; and creating the wire load model dependent on the parasitic information [column 8, lines 19-28], wherein the creating comprises selecting an error bound [column 12, lines 4-6]. As per claim 16, Ponnappalli et al. further disclose wherein generating parasitic information uses a field solver [column 2, lines 30-34; column 7, lines 13-15]. As per claim 17, Ponnappalli et al. further disclose wherein creating the wire load model uses a non-linear curve-fitting engine [column 7, lines 61-

62; column 8, line 27]. As per claim 18, Ponnappalli et al. further disclose wherein the parasitic information comprises at least once selected from the group consisting of an area capacitance, a coupling capacitance, and a fringe capacitance [figures 8-9].

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chou et al. [U.S. Patent #6,291,254 B1].

As per claim 15, Chou et al. disclose a method for creating a wire load model comprising: creating an interconnect configuration [column 8, lines 49-50]; generating parasitic information for the interconnect information, wherein the parasitic information comprises capacitance and resistance information [column 1, lines 34-39; column 8, lines 51-52]; storing the parasitic information in an accessible format [column 9, lines 18-44]; and creating the wire load model dependent on the parasitic information [column 9, lines 14-16; column 10, lines 33-37], wherein the creating comprises selecting an error bound [column 9, line 3; column 12, lines 46-47]. As per claim 16, Chou et al. further disclose wherein generating parasitic information uses a field solver [column 1, lines 34-39; column 8, lines 51-52]. As per claim 17, Chou et al. further disclose wherein creating the wire load model uses a non-linear curve-fitting engine [column 9, lines 14-16]. As per claim 18, Chou et al. further disclose wherein the parasitic information comprises at least once selected from the group consisting of an area capacitance, a coupling capacitance, and a fringe capacitance [column 1, lines 28-39].

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 05 August 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show

Art Unit: 2825


certain features of applicant's invention as broadly recited in claims 15-18, it is noted that the specific features upon which applicant relies are not so recited. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leigh Marie Garbowski whose telephone number is 703-305-9753. The examiner can normally be reached on days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on 703-308-1323. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1782.

  
**LEIGH M. GARBOWSKI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**